

## **Remarks**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 5 and 11 have been amended. No claims have been added. Claims 2-4, 6, 8-10, and 15-31 have been cancelled previously. Thus, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 11-14, and 32 are pending.

### OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings were objected to for failing to show each feature of the invention as specified in the claims, specifically, the register in claim 5. Claim 5 has been amended to be consistent with the figures as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

### OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification was objected to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Office Action points to the amendments made in the last response. Support for the identified amendments can be found in the specification and figures as originally filed, for example, at page 3, lines 8-29; page 5, line 6, line 10, lines 11-12; page 5, line 30 to page 6, line 1; page 6, lines 2-6, lines 13-18; Figure 1, element 23, Figure 3. Therefore, Applicants request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 32 were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As discussed above, support for the identified amendments can be found in the specification and figures as originally filed, for example, at page 3, lines 8-29; page 5, line 6, line 10, lines 11-12; page 5, line 30 to page 6, line 1; page 6, lines 2-6, lines 13-18; Figure 1, element 23, Figure 3. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of the claims as failing to comply with the written description requirement be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIMS 1, 2, 5, 11 AND 14

Claims 1, 2, 5, 11 and 14 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,266,736 issued to Atkinson, et al. (*Atkinson*) U.S. Patent No. 6,449,625 issued to Wang (*Wang*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 5, 11 and 14 are not rendered obvious by *Atkinson* and *Wang*.

Claim 1 recites:

an array of non-volatile memory cells; and  
a stack controller coupled to receive an address and to determine an appropriate address for accessing values in a stack stored in a subset of the array of non-volatile memory cells, the stack having a stack depth configured in a nonvolatile memory to store parameter values, where each memory write invalidates previous data and further wherein the stack controller increments a pointer to a first valid word in the stack, the stack controller to maintain the stack utilizing two blocks of the non-volatile memory cells and to cause a first block to be erased when each word within the first block is invalid and the values in the stack are stored in a second block of the non-volatile memory.

Similarly, claim 11 recites:

receiving an address corresponding to an access to the stack;

maintaining a nonvolatile stack to store parameter values in words of a nonvolatile memory where a write of the nonvolatile stack invalidates previous instructions or data stored in the nonvolatile stack;  
incrementing a pointer to a first valid word in the stack;  
maintaining the stack utilizing two blocks of the non-volatile memory cells and to cause a first block to be erased when each word within the first block is invalid and the values in the stack are stored in a second block of the non-volatile memory.

Thus, Applicants claim monitoring invalid values and erasing a block when all words in the block are invalid. Further, the pointer used to access the stack is incremented.

In contrast to the claimed invention, *Wang* discloses maintaining two logical stacks and performing garbage collection after each access rather than when all blocks are invalid. See Abstract. *Atkinson* discloses use of two memory sections where the role of the memory sections is reversed each time new information is loaded. See col. 4, lines 27-29. Because *Atkinson* discloses alternating between sections, *Atkinson* cannot teach or suggest incrementing as recited in the claims. Therefore, no combination of *Atkinson* and *Wang* can teach or suggest claims 1 and 11.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1. Claim 14 depends from claim 11. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2, 5 and 14 are not anticipated by *Wang* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIMS 7, 12 AND 13

Claims 7, 12 and 13 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Atkinson* and *Wang* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,568,423 issued to Jou, et al. (*Jou*). *Jou* is

cited to teach a smart stack controller. Further, the Office Action asserts that distribution of write cycles indicates a smart stack controller. The Office Action provides no support or analysis for this assertion. Therefore, Applicants submit that it is an improper rejection. Applicants submit that, as described in the specification, a smart stack controller is not defined by a single function.

Claims 7, 12 and 13 are dependent claims that depend from independent claims discussed above. *Jou* does not cure the deficiencies of *Atkinson* and *Wang* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Atkinson*, *Wang* and *Jou* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 7, 12 and 13.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIM 32

Claim 32 was rejected as being unpatentable over *Atkinson* and *Wang* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0061436 of Royer, Jr., et al. (*Royer*). *Royer* is cited to disclose a polymer memory. See Office Action at page 7. *Royer* does not cure the deficiencies of *Atkinson* and *Wang* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Atkinson*, *Wang* and *Royer* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 32.

#### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 11-14, and 32 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present

application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit

Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

Date: October 15, 2008 /Paul A. Mendonsa/  
Paul A. Mendonsa  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 439-8778